

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,549	07/16/2003	Marianne O'Shea	059490-5016	5947
9629	9629 7590 10/19/2006		EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			WILLIAMS, LEONARD M	
	TON, DC 20004	ıw	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1617	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/619,549	O'SHEA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Leonard M. Williams	1617	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we use to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5) □ 6) ☑ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-11 and 24-27 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 and 24-27 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	r election requirement.	Examiner.	
11)□	Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte	

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/26/2006 has been entered.

Status of Claims

The amendment/remarks received in the office 7/26/2006 amending claim 1 and 6 and adding new claims 26-27 have been entered. Claims 1-11 and 24-27 are currently pending.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

The applicant's hae amended claim 1 to include the phrase"...in need of such treatment..." and claim 6 to remove "... coronavirus or a...".

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 24-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new rejection necessitated by applicant's amendment and addition of new claims.

The applicant's assert on page 5 of the remarks that Cook et al. do not disclose treating any subject with the common cold. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In the rejection detailed in the prior office action it is clearly stated that Cook et al teach a method for treating the symptoms associated with a viral infection (including members of the picornavirus such as rhinovirus-which causes more than 50% of common colds-Robbins Pathologic Basis of Disease, 5th edition, pg 322).

Cook et al. disclose the use of CLA in a method of treating symptoms associated with the production of TNF in animals (including humans) caused by viral infections.

Cook et al. does specifically disclose weight loss as one symptom that can be treated but does not limit the symptoms treatable to only being weight loss. The examiner further points out that the treatment of an animal suffering a viral infection by administration of CLA would inherently treat any and all symptoms associated with infection by the virus. Thus the treatment of symptoms associated with the common cold as currently claimed are inherently treated by the method of Cook et al.

The examiner respectfully points out the following: "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. "A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The examiner respectfully points out the following from MPEP § 2112.01: "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a

scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

For the reasons stated above and further for the reasons of the previous office action the 102(b) rejection is maintained over claims 1-11. New claims 24 and 25 are also anticipated by the prior art of record under 102(b) as inherent. As the new claims have not been previously addressed, the 102(b) rejection is withdrawn and a new 102(b) rejection is made to address the new claims. The 102(b) rejection is thus expanded to include claims 24 and 25. The expanded rejection is stated below to reflect these changes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook et al. (US Patent No. 5827885).

Cook et al. teach, in col. 2 lines 30-50, a method of treating symptoms associated with the production of TNF production in animals, including humans, caused by viral infection via administration of a conjugated linoleic acid (CLA).

Cook et al. teach in col. 7 lines 43-65, that the CLA utilized in the invention include cis 9, trans 11 and trans 10, cis 12 isomers. Cook et al. teach, in col. 8 lines 40-65, that the CLA compositions and their non-toxic derivatives can be added to an animal or human's food or formed into tablets, capsules, solutions, and emulsions. The exact amount to be administered depends on the CLA used but generally will be from about 1ppm to about 10,000ppm in an animal's or human's diet and that the CLA amounts to be added can range from 0.01% to 2.0% or more by weight of the animal's or human's food. As evidenced by the sample menu for a 2000 calorie food pattern from the USDA's website (mypyramid.gov/downloads/sample_menu.pdf) the total amount of food consumed daily (including proteins, carbohydrates, total fats and total dietary fiber) is 460g. If the added CLA is to be 0.01-2% then it would correspond to 0.046-9.2g daily.

Cook et al. teach, in col. 9 lines 4-20, that the method comprising administration of CLA (a conjugated fatty acid) to an animal, including a human, for the treatment of symptoms associated with viral infection includes picornavirus (which includes rhinovirus), togavirus, paramyxoviris, orthomyxovirus, rhabdovirus, reovirus, retrovirus, bunyavirus, coronavirus, arenavirus, parovirus, papovavirus, adenovirus, herpesvirus, and poxvirus anticipating the "...method of...treating a common cold...which comprises administering...conjugated fatty acids and derivatives thereof" of claim 1, the "...method...wherein said mammal is human" of claim 2, the "...method...wherein said

mammal is administered a composition comprising a conjugated fatty acid or a derivative thereof and wherein said composition is a pharmaceutical composition, a foodstuff or a food supplement" of claim 3, the "...method wherein the conjugated fatty acid or derivative thereof is conjugated linoleic acid or a derivative thereof" of claim 4. the "...method...for reducing the recovery time after a common cold" of claim 5, the "...method...wherein the common cold is caused by a coronavirus or a rhinovirus" of claim 6, the "...method...wherein the amount of conjugated fatty acid or derivative thereof is from 0.1 to about 20g of conjugated fatty acid or derivative thereof per day" of claim 7, the "...method...wherein the conjugated linoleic acid or derivative thereof comprises trans10, cis12, and cis9, trans11 isomers and the weight ratio of trans10, cis12 isomer to cis9, trans11 isomer is at least 1.2:1" of claim 8, the "...method...wherein said mammal is administered a composition comprising a conjugated fatty acid or a derivative thereof wherein said composition is a foodstuff..." of claim 9, the "...method...wherein said mammal is administered a composition comprising a conjugated fatty acid or a derivative thereof and wherein said composition is a pharmaceutical composition..." of claim 10, the "...method...wherein said mammal is administered a composition...wherein said composition is a food supplement in the form of a soft gel or hard capsule..." of claim 11, the "...method...which comprises the treatment of one or more of..." of claim 24, the "...method...for the treatment of sore throat" of claim 25, the "... method of treating a common cold..." of claim 26, and the "... method... wherein the conjugated linoleic acid... comprises trans10, cis12 and cis9, trans11 isomers..." of claim 27.

Page 6

The examiner respectfully points out the following: "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. "A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The examiner respectfully points out the following from MPEP § 2112.01: "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard M. Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-0685. The examiner can normally be reached on MF 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LMW

SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER